R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 011 774 JC 670 378

PRESIDENTS OF PUBLIC JUNIOR COLLEGES, AN ANALYSIS OF SELECTED BACKGROUND FACTORS.

BY- SCHULTZ, RAYMOND E. ROBERTS, DAYTON Y.
FLORIDA ST. UNIV., TALLAHASSEE

PUB DATE NOV 64

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.09 HC-$1.24 31P.

DESCRIPTORS- *JUNIOR COLLEGES, *COLLEGE ADMINISTRATION, *ADMINISTRATIVE PERSONNEL, *ADMINISTRATOR CHARACTERISTICS, *ADMINISTRATOR BACKGROUND, GOVERNANCE, PRESIDENTS, CHIEF ADMINISTRATORS, TALLAHASSEE

DATA GATHERED FROM QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES AND FROM BIOGRAPHICAL PUBLICATIONS ARE USED TO STUDY 333 JUNIOR COLLEGE PRESIDENTS AND OTHER PERSONNEL WITH MAJOR ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSIBILITIES IN BOTH PUBLIC AND PRIVATE INSTITUTIONS. EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND IS COMPARED IN TERMS OF LEVEL OF DEGREE HELD AND PERIOD OF APPOINTMENT. PREVIOUS EXPERIENCE AND RECRUITMENT PATTERNS ARE SUMMARIZED IN RELATION TO STATE AND ADMINISTRATIVE GOVERNANCE TYPOLOGY. FEWER THAN HALF OF THE ADMINISTRATORS (44.1 PERCENT) POSSESS A DOCTORAL DEGREE, AND TWO-THIRDS OF THOSE HOLD THE ED.D. DEGREE. A WIDE VARIATION IN THE PROPORTION OF DOCTORATE HOLDERS AMONG STATES IS NOTED. NEARLY THREE-FOURTHS (72.1 PERCENT) OF THE ENTIRE GROUP SPECIALIZED IN PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION FOR THEIR HIGHEST DEGREE. EIGHTY PERCENT OF THESE PRESIDENTS CAME TO THEIR ASSIGNMENTS DIRECTLY FROM SOME OTHER ADMINISTRATIVE POST. A TREND TOWARD SELECTING MORE PRESIDENTS FROM THE SENIOR COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY RANKS IS VALIDATED, ALTHOUGH WIDE VARIATIONS AMONG THE STATES IS APPARENT. BOTH SIZE OF THE COLLEGE AND MODE OF LOCAL GOVERNANCE ARE FOUND TO INFLUENCE WHETHER PRESIDENTS ARE SELECTED FROM COLLEGE RANKS OR FROM POSITIONS IN ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS. MEAN AGE OF THE GROUP IS 47 YEARS WITH A RANGE FROM 31 TO 74. THE NET ANNUAL REPLACEMENT NEED IS ESTABLISHED AS 4.7 PERCENT OF THE TOTAL NUMBER. (AL)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

LOCAL
ERIC

ED011774

PRESIDENTS OF PUBLIC JUNIOR COLLEGES

An Analysis of Selected Background Factors

by

Raymond E. Schultz
Professor of Higher Education
Florida State University
Tallahassee, Florida

Dayton Y. Roberts
Assistant to the President
Junior College of Broward County
Ft. Lauderdale, Florida

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

MAY 2 9 1967

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION

Reproduced by
Department of Higher Education
Florida State University
November 1964

JC 670 378

The role played by the junior college in American education has increased steadily in importance over the past two decades. Especially has this been true since the increased birth rate that followed World War II began to be reflected in the college-age population. Accompanying this increase in college-age population has been technological change coupled with favorable economic conditions. These latter factors have created both more of a need and a greater desire for education beyond high school.

While all types of two-year colleges have felt the impact of these changing conditions, public junior colleges have been most dramatically affected. States which previously had few or no such institutions have established or are in the process of establishing state-wide systems; e.g., Florida, Massachusetts, North Carolina, Ohio, and Oregon. States where an appreciable number of public junior colleges already existed are experiencing pronounced enrollment growths and curriculum expansions. Some of these states such as California, Illinois, Michigan, New York, and Washington have also established numerous new institutions.

Accompanying this growth has been increasingly favorable representation of the junior college in newspapers and popular and professional magazines. However, relatively few of the articles appearing in professional journals are analytical in nature. Since specific information is needed as a basis for improvement, more attention to this approach seems needed. It requires "putting the microscope," so to speak, on specific aspects of the institution and its operation. The research reported in this article is of such a nature.

Description of Procedure

This article is based on data collected for a nation-wide predictive study

of junior college administrative needs.[1] That study included presidents and other personnel with major administrative responsibilities in both public and private institutions. Reported here are analyses made of the educational backgrounds, previous experience, and age of those who in the spring of 1963 held positions as chief administrators of public junior colleges of the aggregate United States.[2] In addition, the rate and causes of turnover for this position were determined. To make possible comparisons by state, tabulations were made using those states for which data could be obtained on 8 or more presidents. Sixteen states were included on that basis, and they represented 274 (82.3%) of the entire group reported upon.

Information was solicited from the chief administrators of all public junior colleges listed in the 1963 Junior College Directory.[3] Subsequently the following were eliminated for the reasons noted:

1. Acting presidents. Their status is temporary by definition, and hence it was felt that they might not be representative of junior college presidents. Five were omitted for this reason.

2. Chief administrators of Wisconsin two-year county teachers colleges. This group, numbering 22, administers an antiquated and passing institution on the American educational scene.

---

[1]These predictions appear in a pamphlet entitled Administrators for America's Junior Colleges: A Prediction of Needs 1965-1980 by Raymond E. Schultz. It can be obtained for per copy from the American Association of Junior Colleges, 1777 Massachusetts Avenue, N. W., Washington, D. C.

[2]Most of the data for this paper is from the dissertation of Dayton Y. Roberts entitled "Chief Administrators of Public Junior Colleges: A Prediction of the Number Needed and Sources of Supply 1963-1973." (Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Florida State University, 1964.)

[3]The terms "chief administrator" and "president" are used interchangeably and refer to the individual who has major responsibility for the administration of a campus operation. Therefore, in cities like Chicago and Los Angeles which have several junior college campuses, the head of each one included in the 1963 Junior College Directory was included.

3. Directors of certain extension centers. Information obtained from directors of eleven extension centers indicated that they did not function in the capacity of chief administrator, and hence they were eliminated.

4. Presidents of Negro institutions. This group was eliminated for two related reasons. First, only 19 such institutions existed in 1963, and that number has since been reduced. With the recent progress of racial integration, it seems likely that virtually all public Negro junior colleges will either become fully biracial or be amalgamated with other institutions. Second, 12 of the 19 institutions were located in one state--Florida--and 9 of them had very small enrollments.[1] If the presidents of those institutions had been included, it would have necessitated a separate analysis to avoid a distorted picture of Florida as compared to other states.

5. Presidents of institutions in the process of transition to senior colleges. Four presidents fell in this category.

In summary, the chief administrators of 61 institutions listed in the 1963 Junior College Directory were omitted from consideration. This left 363 administrators as the potential population.

Two types of sources provided the basic data on which the analyses reported herein were made. One was an information form designed for this study, and the other consisted of nationally recognized biographical publications.[2] Information was utilized for 333 junior college presidents or 92 per cent of the total eligible group. Insofar as the literature indicates, this represents by a considerable margin the largest number of public junior college presidents ever studied in such detail.

---

[1] A primary motive in creating them seems to have been a desire to forestall integration. Since that did not prove successful, several have been discontinued, and the same fate can be expected for the others.

[2] These publications were Presidents and Deans of American Colleges and Universities 1962-63, Who's Who in America, Who's Who in American Education, Who's Who in the East, and Who's Who in the South and Southwest.

Review of Related Studies

Only one previous study is reported in the literature which treats the background of public junior college presidents as a distinct group. That study by Shannon was concerned primarily with the chief administrator's self-perception of his role. He did, however, report certain background information on the 240 presidents included in his study.[1]

Other related studies have been reported in which presidents of public junior colleges were included with presidents of other types of two-year colleges. Lewis included 128 junior college presidents and a much larger group of senior college and university presidents in a study of their backgrounds.[2] He made no distinction between private and public junior college presedents in his analyses. A rather comprehensive profile of junior college presidents was drawn by Hawk.[3] His sample consisted of 162 presidents with approximately two-thirds of them in public junior colleges. Like Lewis, he grouped together presidents of public and private institutions.

There have been a number of investigations into the backgrounds of senior college and university presidents. None of these were in recent years, with the study by Lewis, previously mentioned, in 1952-53 being the most recent. One of the earliest and most comprehensive studies of this type was one by Thwing in 1926.[4]

---

[1]William G. Shannon, "The Community College President: A Study of the Role of President of the Public Community Junior College." (Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Columbia University, 1962.)

[2]William P. Lewis, "Backgrounds of College Presidents in the United States 1952-53." (Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, George Peabody College, 1953.)

[3]Ray Hawk, "A Profile of Junior College Presidents," Junior College Journal, 30: 340-46, February, 1960.

[4]Charles F. Thwing, The College President (New York: Macmillan Company, 1926).

Educational Backgrounds

Highest earned degree. All but 10 (3.1%) of the 333 presidents held an earned graduate degree. One hundred seventy-six (52.8%) had a master's as their highest degree, with 147 (44.1%)[1] possessing the doctorate. Of this latter group, nearly twice as many had an Ed.D. as had the Ph.D.--95 as compared to 52.

To determine if the proportion of junior college presidents holding a doctoral degree is increasing, a comparison was made of those appointed during different time periods. (See Table 1) Assuming that the proportion of those who had doctorates is the same for surviving and non-surviving chief administrators, then a greatly increased emphasis is being given the doctorate in the selection of junior college presidents. This trend may be even more pronounced than these comparisons show by virtue of the fact that those appointed longest ago have had more time to complete a doctoral program after assuming their positions than those appointed more recently.

When analyzed by state, wide variation was found in the proportion of presidents who possessed the doctorate. The 16 states used for this purpose are arranged in rank order in Table 2. No obvious explanation could be found for the rank order. For example, in both Florida (which ranked highest) and Massachusetts (which ranked lowest), most public junior colleges were established after 1956.[2] Therefore, recency of appointment did not alone explain a state's rank.

At first inspection, it appeared that neither was type of control related. In Florida, public junior colleges are operated by the local school district, whereas in Massachusetts and in Oklahoma (which ranked second) they are directly under state control. However, when all 333 institutions represented in the study

---

[1] This compares almost exactly with the 43% reported by Shannon, op. cit.

[2] The reader is reminded that the public Negro junior colleges in Florida are excluded.

TABLE I

PER CENT OF PUBLIC JUNIOR COLLEGE PRESIDENTS WITH DOCTORATE DEGREES IN RELATION TO THE PERIOD OF APPOINTMENT

Year President Appointed to Position (Inclusive)	Number Appointed Who Are Still In Office	Number with Doctorate	Per Cent With Doctorate
1900-1940	12	1	8.3
1941-1951	56	16	28.5
1952-1958	123	52	42.3
1959-1963	142	78	54.9
Total	333	147	

TABLE 2

HIGHEST EARNED DEGREE OF PUBLIC JUNIOR COLLEGE PRESIDENTS IN STATES WITH EIGHT OR MORE PRESIDENTS REPORTING
N=274

State	Baccalaureate	Master's	Doctorate	Per Cent Doctorates
Florida			17	100.0
Oklahoma		3	5	62.5
California	1	23	37	60.6
Washington		4	6	60.0
New York	2	7	13	59.1
Maryland		5	7	58.3
Georgia		4	4	50.0
Texas		16	13	44.8
Michigan		8	6	42.8
Illinois		16	7	30.4
Kansas		10	3	23.1
Pennsylvania	2	8	3	23.1
Mississippi		11	2	16.7
Iowa		12	2	14.3
Minnesota		7	1	12.5
Massachusetts	1	7	1	11.1
Total	6	141	127	

were classified by type of control, a distinct pattern was observed. It will be noted from Table 3 that the proportion of presidents holding the doctorate was virtually the same in institutions with local independent boards as for institutions sharing their board with the local public schools but having separate facilities. Furthermore, institutions with these two types of control had a much higher percentage with the doctorate (51.7% and 49.2% respectively) than did institutions with regional or state boards. A possible conclusion to be drawn from this analysis is that local control and separate facilities are the conditions most conducive to the selection of doctorate holders as presidents of public junior colleges.

Area of specialization. An analysis was made to determine the area of specialization for the highest degree. Table 4 shows that the area of specialization for the overwhelming majority--72.1%--was professional education. The specialization "higher education" was separated from professional education to ascertain the extent to which it might be represented. Table 4 shows that few presidents now have higher education as a special field of study. An appreciable gain in the number of junior college presidents with this specialization can be expected during the years ahead as a result of the recent increase of enrollments and graduate programs in "higher education."

To obtain a more detailed account of their educational backgrounds, an analysis was made of the area of study for each degree these presidents possessed. The results of this comparison, presented in Table 5, show that public junior college presidents possessed more breadth of background than might be concluded on the basis of the data contained in Table 4. Most of them had an academic major at the undergraduate level, and collectively they held 129 graduate degrees in academic disciplines. Of the academic areas, the social sciences were represented by far the most frequently with the sciences next.

TABLE 3

PER CENT OF PUBLIC JUNIOR COLLEGE PRESIDENTS WITH DOCTORATE DEGREES BY TYPE OF ORGANIZATION AND CONTROL

Type of Organization and Control	Number Presidents Under Each Type Control	Number with Doctorates	Per Cent with Doctorates
Local Shared Board (Shared facilities)*	36	8	22.2
Local Shared Board (Separate facilities)**	128	63	49.2
Local Independent Board	116	60	51.7
Regional or State Board	53	16	30.2
Total	333	147	

*Shared with the local public schools
**A separate campus from that of the local public schools

TABLE 4

AREA OF SPECIALIZATION FOR HIGHEST DEGREE OF PUBLIC JUNIOR COLLEGE PRESIDENTS

Area	No.	Per Cent
Education (without designation)	212	63.7
Higher Education	28	8.4
Humanities and Social Science	59	17.7
Science	30	9.0
Business	4	1.2
Total	333	100.0

TABLE 5

MAJOR AREAS OF STUDY TAKEN
BY PUBLIC JUNIOR COLLEGE PRESIDENTS
(11 most frequently reported)

	Major Area of Study	Total Number All Degrees	Graduate Degrees Only*	Bachelor's Degree**
1.	Education (all areas)	336	296	40
2.	History	76	36	40
3.	English	58	18	40
4.	Math	40	14	26
5.	Chemistry	35	15	20
6.	Psychology	27	18	9
7.	Biology	20	7	13
8.	Economics	19	4	15
9.	Engineering	18	5	13
10.	Political Science	16	10	6
11.	Science (unspecified)	16	2	14

*This column exceeds 333 because many presidents possessed more than one graduate degree.

**This column does not total 333 since a considerable number had undergraduate majors in miscellaneous areas and others held professional degrees only. Also, some did not provide this information.

Previous Experience

Type of position. The group was analyzed in terms of the last previous position held. The results are given in Table 6 and represent considerable divergence. Nearly 80 per cent came directly from some administrative position in education. As might be expected, the largest group (39%) came from other junior college administrative positions. The fact that less than 10 per cent came from other junior college presidencies shows that there was relatively little movement from one junior college presidency to another. In fact, nearly as many (8.8%) came directly from administrative positions in senior colleges.

The second largest group (22.2%) had been in administrative positions in the elementary and secondary schools. When those who came from state departments of education are included with that group, we find that over one-fourth of them (26.7%) had been administrators in positions below the junior college level.

Viewed another way, the data of Table 6 show that the overwhelming majority of these junior college presidents came directly from other administrative positions. Only 12.3 per cent came from teaching, and most of these were from college and university faculties, though this is not revealed in the table. Virtually none assumed their positions directly from graduate school and very few came from outside education.

Type of institution. An analysis was made to ascertain if the picture has been changing in terms of the type of institutions from which junior college presidents are recruited. This was done by grouping these presidents on the basis of the period of their appointments. The results of this analysis are shown in Table 7.

By virtue of the small number of presidents who were appointed before 1941, caution needs to be exercised in extrapolating from the information relative to that group. Nevertheless, some distinct patterns can be observed. For example,

TABLE 6

LAST PREVIOUS POSITION HELD BY
INCUMBENT PUBLIC JUNIOR COLLEGE PRESIDENTS
N=333

Type of Previous Position	N	Per Cent
Administrator in a senior college or university	29	8.8
Chief administrator of another junior college	32	9.6
Administrator (other than president) in a junior college	130	39.0
School administrator (elementary and/or secondary)	74	22.2
Employed by a state department of education	15	4.5
Teacher (any level)	41	12.3
Graduate student	3	.9
Position outside of education	9	2.7
Total	333	100.0

TABLE 7

TYPE OF INSTITUTION FROM WHICH INCUMBENT
PUBLIC JUNIOR COLLEGE PRESIDENTS WERE RECRUITED
IN RELATION TO PERIOD OF EMPLOYMENT
N=333

Type of Institution	Period of Employment			
	Before 1941 % of 12	1941-51 % of 56	1952-58 % of 122	1959-63 % of 143
Senior College or University	8.3 (1)	10.7 (6)	13.1 (16)	21.0 (30)
Same Institution	25.0 (3)	30.4 (17)	25.4 (31)	21.6 (31)
Another Junior College	33.3 (4)	14.3 (8)	27.0 (33)	28.7 (41)
Elementary or secondary school	33.3 (4)	30.4 (17)	28.7 (35)	22.4 (32)
State Department of Education	0	5.3 (3)	4.1 (5)	2.8 (4)
Other (including graduate school)	0	8.9 (5)	1.6 (2)	3.5 (5)
Total	99.9 (12)	100.0 (56)	99.9 (122)	100.0 (143)

there is a definite trend toward recruiting more junior college presidents from positions in senior colleges and universities. Conversely, there is a trend away from recruiting from elementary and secondary schools. Even so, the proportion being recruited from below the college level is still considerable. The junior college itself has been the primary source from which these presidents were recruited. Of the total group over the entire period, exactly half were employed in a junior college immediately prior to becoming presidents. There appears to be a slight trend toward more coming from another junior college rather than being promoted from within the institution. Incidentally, while not shown in Table 7, only three of these 333 presidents came directly from a position in a private junior college.

The data of Table 7 raise the question as to whether a larger proportion of junior college presidents should not be recruited from within the junior college ranks. Stated another way, can the public junior college develop an articulate philosophy with such a divergence of backgrounds among its administrators? Or, does this divergence of backgrounds bring to the junior college movement a variety of viewpoints that constitutes a strength?

To ascertain if variations existed among states in terms of where these junior college presidents were recruited, several other analyses were made. Three of them are presented and discussed here; namely, (1) a state by state comparison, (2) a comparison by type of control, and (3) a comparison by institutional enrollment.

The analysis by state failed to reveal any clear-cut patterns. Also, due to the small numbers involved in some states, percentage comparisons tended to create distortions. As might be expected, those states with a considerable number of older junior colleges have recruited a high proportion of their

presidents from the junior college ranks. Although Table 8 does not provide this breakdown, most of them were recruited from institutions within the state where employed.

It will be observed from Table 8 that pronounced differences existed among states in the proportion of presidents recruited from senior colleges and universities. California drew a smaller proportion of its presidents from this source than one might expect. Three of the states which ranked highest on this basis, Massachusetts, Maryland, and Florida, had recently established most of their junior colleges. This suggests that when a state is rapidly expanding its public junior college system, it utilizes a variety of sources for obtaining presidents to head up these institutions. A surprising situation is present in the case of Massachusetts, however; namely, that drawing heavily upon this source does not necessarily result in a high proportion of presidents who possess the doctorate. It will be recalled from the data of Table 2 that Massachusetts had the lowest proportion of doctorate holders of any state analyzed. Conversely, in Florida, which had also recruited from senior colleges and universities to a considerable degree, all presidents had doctoral degrees.

Table 9 presents the analysis based on type of institutional control. Here one can observe distinct variations. Junior colleges having local boards which shared their facilities with local public schools were a group apart in terms of where their presidents were recruited. They attracted a considerably smaller proportion of their presidents from senior colleges and universities and a far larger proportion from elementary and secondary schools than did institutions under other types of control -- including those with local shared boards but with separate facilities. The other three categories recruited approximately the same proportion of their presidents from senior colleges and universities.

A major surprise resulting from this analysis was the fact that institutions

TABLE 8

TYPE OF INSTITUTION FROM WHICH INCUMBENT PUBLIC JUNIOR COLLEGE PRESIDENTS WERE RECRUITED IN SELECTED STATES

State	Total N=274	Per Cent Recruited From*			
		Sr.College or university	Junior College	Elem. or Sec.School	Other
California	61	8.2 (5)	73.8 (45)	18.0 (11)	-- (0)
Texas	29	17.2 (5)	65.6 (19)	17.2 (5)	-- (0)
Illinois	23	8.7 (2)	52.2 (12)	39.1 (9)	-- (0)
New York	22	13.6 (3)	54.5 (12)	13.6 (3)	18.2 (4)
Florida	17	29.4 (5)	41.2 (7)	17.6 (3)	11.8 (2)
Iowa	14	7.1 (1)	-- (0)	85.7 (12)	7.1 (1)
Michigan	14	-- (0)	42.9 (6)	50.0 (7)	7.1 (1)
Mississippi	13	-- (0)	69.2 (9)	15.4 (2)	15.4 (2)
Kansas	13	-- (0)	61.5 (8)	30.8 (4)	7.7 (1)
Pennsylvania	13	15.4 (2)	61.5 (8)	15.4 (2)	7.7 (1)
Maryland	12	41.7 (5)	25.0 (3)	25.0 (3)	8.3 (1)
Washington	10	20.0 (2)	60.0 (6)	10.0 (1)	10.0 (1)
Massachusetts	9	44.4 (4)	22.2 (2)	-- (0)	33.3 (3)
Georgia	8	50.0 (4)	25.0 (2)	-- (0)	25.0 (2)
Minnesota	8	12.5 (1)	75.0 (6)	12.5 (1)	-- (0)
Oklahoma	8	25.0 (2)	25.0 (2)	37.5 (3)	12.5 (1)

*Because of the small numbers involved, these classifications have been combined from those used in Table 7.

TABLE 9

TYPE OF INSTITUTION FROM WHICH INCUMBENT PUBLIC JUNIOR COLLEGE PRESIDENTS WERE RECRUITED COMPARED BY TYPE OF CONTROL OF PRESENT INSTITUTION
N=333

Type of Institution	Type of Control of Present Institution			
	Local Shared Board* (shared facilities) (N=36)	Local Shared Board (separate facilities) (N=128)	Local Independent Board (N=116)	Regional or State Board (N=53)
Senior college or university	8.3 (3)	15.6 (20)	17.2 (20)	18.9 (10)
Same institution	16.7 (6)	20.3 (26)	33.6 (39)	21.0 (11)
Another junior college	13.9 (5)	29.7 (38)	29.3 (34)	16.9 (9)
Elementary or secondary school	50.0 (18)	30.5 (39)	13.8 (16)	28.3 (15)
State department of education	2.8 (1)	2.3 (3)	3.5 (4)	7.5 (4)
Other (including graduate study)	8.3 (3)	1.6 (2)	2.6 (3)	7.5 (4)

*See explanatory note for Table 3.

with local independent boards recruited an appreciably smaller proportion of their presidents from the elementary and secondary schools than did any of the other categories. One might expect that institutions under regional or state boards would have had this distinction. However, they recruited nearly as high a proportion of their presidents from elementary and secondary schools as did institutions with local shared boards and separate facilities.

Junior colleges with local independent boards had "home grown" presidents, to use the vernacular. It will be observed from Table 9 that 62.9 per cent of the presidents of these institutions came directly from the junior college ranks. (This figure is obtained by combining the two "junior college" categories.) The corresponding proportion was 50 per cent for institutions with shared boards and local facilities, 37.9 per cent for those with regional or state boards, and but 30.6 per cent for those with local shared boards and shared facilities.

Table 10 shows that elementary and secondary schools were the major source of presidents for junior colleges with small enrollments. Over 40 per cent of the presidents of institutions with under 400 enrollment came directly from such positions. By contrast, only 13.6 per cent of the presidents of junior colleges with enrollments 2000 and over came from this source.

One might expect the reverse of what was found in the proportion of chief administrators who were recruited from senior colleges and universities. The fact that the proportion is lowest in the 2000 and over enrollment category is certainly not what might be anticipated. This may, in part at least, be a result of selection practices in California where a preponderance of the nation's very large junior colleges are located and where, as is shown in Table 8, most presidents were selected from other junior college positions.

That supposition is supported by the fact that 72.8 per cent of the presidents in institutions with enrollments of 2000 and over came from this source. The percentage dropped for each subsequent smaller enrollment category

TABLE 10

TYPE OF INSTITUTION FROM WHICH INCUMBENT PUBLIC JUNIOR COLLEGE PRESIDENTS WERE RECRUITED BY ENROLLMENT OF PRESENT INSTITUTION
N=333

Type of Institution	Enrollment Category of Present Institution			
	Under 400 (N=85)	400-799 (N=89)	800-1999 (N=71)	2000 and over (N=88)
Senior College or University	18.8 (16)	20.2 (18)	12.7 (9)	11.4 (10)
Same Institution	17.6 (15)	21.4 (19)	26.8 (19)	33.0 (29)
Another junior college	16.5 (14)	19.1 (17)	28.2 (20)	39.8 (35)
Elementary or secondary school	41.2 (35)	25.8 (23)	25.4 (18)	13.6 (12)
State department of education	3.5 (3)	5.6 (5)	2.8 (2)	2.3 (2)
Other (including graduate school)	2.4 (2)	7.9 (7)	4.2 (3)	-- (0)

and was only 34.1 per cent for institutions with enrollments of under 400 students. There may also be reflected here the fact that junior colleges with larger staffs have more opportunity than those with small staffs to attract into second echelon roles young administrators with the potential to become presidents. Another contributing factor may be presidents who were recruited from senior college and university staffs to head up new junior colleges which initially have small enrollments.

Ages

This group of presidents ranged in age from 31 to 74 years with a median age of 47. Those falling at the first quartile of the age distribution were 42 years old while those at the third quartile were 57. The mean age for the group was 50.3 years, which is 1.3 years older than the 49 years reported by Lewis for the 128 public and private junior college presidents included in his study.[1]

No other data were found on the mean age of junior college presidents. However, several studies have reported the age of such presidents at the time of appointment. Lewis reported that the mean age of his sample at the time of appointment to the presidency was 41 years. Hawk, in 1960, reported that the mean age at the time of appointment for his sample of 162 junior college presidents (about two-thirds of whom were in public institutions) was 42.5 years.[2] By comparison, the mean age at the time of appointment for this group was found to be 43.1 years. Inasmuch as the samples used by Lewis and Hawk also included private junior college presidents, a further analysis was made of the data to ascertain if there was a trend toward selecting older public junior college presidents. The median as well as the first and third quartile distribution was

---

[1] Lewis, op. cit., p. 39.

[2] Hawk, op. cit., p. 342.

computed for presidents who were appointed during three successive time periods as follows:

PERIOD APPOINTED	AGE OF PRESIDENTS AT SELECTED DISTRIBUTION POINTS		
	First Quartile	Median	Third Quartile
1948-52	38	42	47
1953-57	38	43	50
1958-62	40	45	50

The above evidence reveals that there has been a slight trend toward selecting older individuals as presidents of public junior colleges. One might have expected exactly the opposite trend in light of the large number of new institutions which have been established in recent years.

As a further analysis, age distributions were compared by state. The results are presented in Table 11. It shows that there was considerable variability among these 16 states in the mean ages of public junior college presidents. There is no apparent explanation for these differences. For example, nearly all these presidents in Florida and Massachusetts had been appointed but a short time, and yet their mean ages varied considerably. Further, an examination of Table 2 in relation to Table 11 shows that there was no correlation between age and the proportion of doctorate holders. Finally, there was no indication that states with many long-established institutions had a preponderance of older presidents. In fact, of California's 61 presidents, only 4 were over 60 years of age.

Reasons Positions Became Available

Turnover is not, of course, directly related to the backgrounds of the public junior college presidents included in this study. However, the reasons that the positions which they held became available and the frequency with which such vacancies developed were factors directly relevant to the purpose of this report. For these reasons, an analysis was made to determine the factors that

TABLE 11

AGE DISTRIBUTIONS AND MEAN AGES OF PUBLIC JUNIOR COLLEGE PRESIDENTS IN 16 STATES
N=274

State	30-40	41-50	51-60	61 & Over	Mean Age
Florida	3	14	0	0	44.8
Washington	1	7	2	0	46.7
Michigan	2	6	5	1	47.7
Iowa	2	5	5	2	48.4
Illinois	4	9	8	2	48.6
Maryland	2	6	3	1	49.2
Minnesota	1	3	4	0	49.5
Pennsylvania	3	3	6	1	49.7
California	3	29	25	4	51.0
Massachusetts	2	3	3	1	52.0
Kansas	2	4	4	3	57.1
Texas	3	8	12	6	53.1
Mississippi	1	4	4	4	53.2
New York	1	4	11	6	54.5
Oklahoma	0	3	2	3	54.7
Georgia	1	2	2	3	54.9
Total	31	110	96	37	

accounted for vacancies occurring in this position. (See Table 12)

No trends are observed in Table 12 as to the reasons that vacancies occurred. There seemed to be more similarity between the first (1947 and before) period and the last (1958-63) period than between either of these and the two (1947-52 and 1953-57) intervening time periods. Considering the entire group, it will be noted that approximately one-third were the first presidents of their institution, another one-third filled vacancies left by presidents who resigned to accept other positions, and the remaining one-third filled vacancies occurring for other reasons; i.e., retirements, deaths, and resignations before obtaining another position. The fact that 11.7 per cent filled positions in which the predecessor was released or resigned before accepting another position may be a rough index as to the proportion of public junior college presidents who are unsuccessful or extremely dissatisfied in that role.

Only one previous effort appears to have been made to ascertain turnover of public junior college presidents. Henderson stated that the leadership of 286 such institutions in 24 states changed hands 288 times during the period 1947-57.[1] Hawk accepted this statement as evidence that the cycle of leadership in public junior colleges is completed each decade.[2] Since Henderson did not describe his procedure, it is not possible to ascertain if his figures could be used as a basis of comparison for those derived in this investigation. When the turnover rate of public junior college presidents was computed for the period 1953-54 through 1962-63, a mean annual gross turnover rate of 5.2 per cent was obtained. (See Table 13) When those administrators who came from other presidencies were eliminated, the mean annual net replacement need was

---

[1]Algo D. Henderson, "How Shall We Get Top Leadership for Community Colleges?" Speech delivered in New York at a conference of the American Association of Junior Colleges, February, 1958.

[2]Hawk, op. cit., p. 346.

TABLE 12

REASONS POSITIONS HELD BY JUNIOR COLLEGE PRESIDENTS BECAME AVAILABLE

Reason Position Became Available	Per Cent by Period				
	1947 & Before	1948-52	1953-57	1958-63	Total
Predecessor resigned to accept another position	37.5 (15)	28.6(10)	23.5(20)	32.9(57)	30.6(102)
Predecessor released or resigned before accepting another position	17.5 (7)	17.1 (6)	9.4 (8)	10.4(18)	11.7(39)
Predecessor retired or deceased	2.5 (1)	25.7 (9)	37.6(32)	15.1(26)	20.4(68)
Predecessor's fate unknown or not given	7.5 (3)	5.7 (2)	7.1 (6)	3.0 (5)	4.8(16)
First person to hold position	35.0 (14)	22.9 (8)	22.3(19)	38.7(67)	32.4(108)
Total N.	(40)	(35)	(85)	(173)	100.0(333)

found to be 4.7 per cent for the ten-year period. Both of these rates are, of course, much lower than the 10 per cent figure advanced by Henderson. The fact that the turnover rates for two of the last three years were considerably above the means may be an indication that there is a recent trend toward more turnover in public junior college presidencies.

Table 13 illustrates the computations made to obtain the turnover rates previously mentioned. These computations were obtained by using the number of public junior colleges in existence for the years 1953-54 through 1962-63 which met the criteria for this study. That number was further reduced by 8 per cent to obtain a number comparable to the 92 per cent of all remaining public junior colleges represented in this investigation. (Col. 2) The number of newly appointed presidents for each year under consideration was then determined. (Col. 3) From this figure was subtracted the number who were heading newly established institutions. (Col. 4) The number in Column 4 was then divided by the number in Column 2 to give the annual gross turnover rate. (Col. 5) Finally, the number in Column 6 was divided by the number in Column 2 to give the net replacement need. (Col. 7)

Summary

Following is a brief summarization and commentary upon this picture of the educational and experience backgrounds of public junior college presidents provided by this study.

Less than half (44.1 %) of them possessed an earned doctoral degree. Nearly two-thirds of those with such a degree possessed the Ed.D. There was wide variation in the proportion of doctorate holders among states ranging from 100 to less than 12 per cent for the 16 states analyzed on this basis. The proportion was lowest for institutions with local school boards and shared facilities, being but 22.2 per cent and not much higher, 30.2 per cent, for

TABLE 13

TURNOVER OF PUBLIC JUNIOR COLLEGE PRESIDENTS FOR A TEN-YEAR PERIOD

Col.1 Year	Col.2 N. of Institutions	Col.3 N. of newly Appt. Presidents	Col.4 N. not newly est.Positions	Col.5 Gross Turnover rate (Per Cent)	Col.6 No. not previously public J. C.Presidents	Col.7 Net Replacement Need (Per Cent)
1953-54	278	20	16	5.8	14	5.0
1954-55	276	10	8	2.9	7	2.5
1955-56	300	14	12	4.0	12	4.0
1956-57	311	17	13	4.1	12	3.8
1957-58	322	21	14	4.3	14	4.3
1958-59	330	32	17	5.1	16	4.8
1959-60	327	21	13	3.9	12	3.7
1960-61	313	39	23	7.3	19	6.1
1961-62	326	42	15	4.6	14	4.3
1962-63	342	46	32	9.9	29	8.5
			Mean gross turnover rate	5.2	Mean replacement need	4.7

institutions under regional or state boards. There was virtually no difference between institutions with local independent boards and those with local shared boards but separate facilities. Approximately 50 per cent of the presidents possessed the doctorate in both instances.

Nearly three-fourths (72.1 %) of the entire group specialized in professional education for their highest degree. Only 8.4 per cent identified any phase of "higher education" as their area of study within professional education. However, a majority of them majored in an academic discipline at the undergraduate level with social science being most frequently represented, followed by some phase of science.

Eighty per cent of these presidents came to their assignments directly from some other administrative position. Nearly half of the total (48.6 %) had held another junior college administrative position. Another 22.2 per cent came from a position in elementary and/or secondary school administration, and 8.8 per cent came from a senior college or university administrative position. Of the 12.3 per cent who came from teaching, most were on college or university faculties.

Considerable variation existed among states in the proportion of public junior college presidents recruited from senior colleges and universities. It was highest in states with recently established or expanded junior college systems. Surprisingly, however, states that drew heavily from this source did not necessarily have a high ratio of doctorate holders. The fact that institutions with enrollments under 800 had a higher proportion of presidents who were recruited from senior colleges and universities than did institutions with enrollments over 2,000 no doubt reflected the fact that many of these had been established only recently. That supposition is supported by the fact that when an analysis was made in terms of when a president was appointed, a distinct

trend was found toward selecting relatively more presidents from the senior college and university ranks.

Conversely, the trend was away from selecting presidents who had positions in elementary and secondary schools. The proportion was still considerable, however, amounting to 22.4 per cent of those appointed during the period 1959-63. Wide variation existed among states in this respect, ranging from 85.7 per cent for Iowa and 50 per cent for Michigan to none for Georgia and Massachusetts. The type of board control seemed to be an important factor here. Half of all presidents in institutions with local shared boards and shared facilities came from positions in elementary and secondary schools. Conversely, only 13.6 per cent of those in institutions governed by independent local boards came from such positions.

It was found that the larger junior colleges became, the more likely boards were to select presidents directly from the junior college ranks. Over twice as large a proportion of the presidents of institutions with enrollments of 2000 and over were selected from this source as compared with institutions under 400 in enrollment--72.8 per cent and 34.1 per cent.

The median age for the group was 47 years with a range from 31 to 74. Wide variation was found among states, Florida having the youngest group with an average age of 44.8 years and Georgia the oldest with 54.9. Relative newness of institutions was thought to bear a possible relationship to age, but this was not found to be the case. Florida and Massachusetts both with many recently established institutions ranked 1 and 10 respectively, whereas Iowa and Mississippi, neither with a significant number of recently established institutions, ranked 4 and 13 respectively among the 16 states analyzed.

An analysis of the reasons that the positions held by these presidents became available showed that roughly one-third of their predecessors resigned to accept another position, one-third were in newly established positions, and

one-fifth were in positions which became available due to retirements or deaths. Another 11.7 per cent were in positions where the predecessor had been released of resigned before accepting another position. The total or gross annual turnover rate for this position was found to be 5.2 per cent. When those who moved from one public junior college presidency to another were excluded, the net annual replacement need, i.e., the number of new presidents that must be recruited each year to fill vacancies created by turnover, was established as 4.7 per cent of the total number.